

“E

5 P285.1.10 E-238  
cop 2

A REPLY

TO THE

“REVIEW REVIEWED”

OF THE

REV. D. INGLIS:

AND A VINDICATION OF A “REVIEW OF THE STATE AND CONDITION  
OF THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,  
SINCE THE UNION IN 1861.”

BY THE REV. ALEX. F. KEMP, M. A.,  
WINDSOR, C. W.

SARNIA:  
PRINTED AT THE “OBSERVER” STEAM JOB OFFICE.

1867.

A 6443



DEC 3 1935

THE di  
since t  
lished,  
in the  
Mr. Ki  
the Re  
been w  
justifi  
of the  
phrase  
and cat  
these t  
aware  
either  
hard n  
their m

They  
sion of  
should  
manife  
open to  
official  
must a  
tage.\*  
gentler  
to be p  
sense o  
with p  
not.  
the Cl  
the pa  
centra  
shown  
and th  
been r  
the Op  
nod m  
tions a  
racteri

\* Th  
of pub  
one wh  
ought  
The m  
ment o  
conduc  
vol. 6,

# A REPLY

## TO THE

### "REVIEW REVIEWED," &c.

---

THE REVIEW OF THE STATE AND CONDITION of the Canada Presbyterian Church, since the Union in 1861, which I lately published, has elicited two very ardent replies; one in the shape of a published Address, by the Rev. Mr. King, of Toronto; the other, a pamphlet by the Rev. D. Inglis, of Hamilton. The first has been written with a bitterness of feeling quite unjustifiable; the other, while avoiding the temper of the Address, yet uses a license of epithet and phrase inconsistent with the character of a fair and candid Reviewer. But I do not complain of these things; I merely note them. I am well aware that those who aim at reforming abuses in either State or Church, must expect to be called hard names, to have their failings magnified, and their motives maligned.

There is, however, no reason why the discussion of the questions involved in the "Review" should excite so much feeling as my antagonists manifest. The matters are public, and fairly open to criticism and debate. If they do touch official persons, this cannot be helped. They must accept their honors with this disadvantage.\* Public discussion, when conducted by gentlemen, Christians, and scholars, cannot fail to be productive of good. It quickens alike the sense of responsibility in those who are invested with power, and the lethargy of those who are not. In this case it has awakened reflection in the Church, has elicited elaborate defences on the part of the advocates and maintainers of a centralized system of Church administration, and shown how little they have to say for themselves and their schemes. Appearance having thus been put in for both sides—the Government and the Opposition—let us hope that when the Synod meets we shall be able to deal with the questions at issue with the calmness that should characterise masters in Israel.

\* The power of passing censures on the conduct of public men, in the name of right and wrong, is one which, in some form or other, has existed, and ought to exist in every well-ordered community. The most effective, and least objectionable instrument of such criticism, is the public press, as it is conducted at the present day.—*Froude's England*, vol. 6, page 446.

I have already briefly replied to Mr. King in the *Globe* of 29th March last. As, however, the space allowed did not permit an extended and detailed exposure of his fallacies and errors, I therefore intend alluding to several points in his address in the course of my reply to the pamphlet of Mr. Inglis.

At the outset I remark, that it seems strange to me that in this land of liberty there should be shown so much of the spirit of intolerance on the part of my Reviewers. They appear, as it were, to hold up their hands in holy horror at my Review, as if it were a piece of audacious sacrilege. Mr. Inglis gravely characterises it as "contrary to the good order of our Presbyterian Church Government," as if, forsooth, that government was inimical to the liberty of debate which is so dear to every citizen of a free country. It is a libel against one of the best forms of Church order, to make it an ally of a species of priestly intolerance. It is the old and easy way of doing things, to put down opposition by an appeal to Church Courts and Church allegiance; but it won't do in these days. Men of independent minds, and who have just conceptions of the range and limits of ecclesiastical authority, will kick against all such intolerance and tyranny, and assert for themselves the right of free speech, both in and out of the sacred precincts of Church Courts. If the discussion only beget a little more tolerance of personal liberty and public debate in ecclesiastical minds, it will not have been without its use.

My aim in the "Review" was to present to the Church a fair approximate estimate of its general state and condition for the past four years, as compared with the state of the two Churches for the four years before the Union, ending with 1859. This I endeavoured to do by comparing the data afforded by the published statistics of the Churches during these two periods, in the three departments of the Ministry, the Membership, and the Stipend accounts. In the vindication of that "Review" I shall follow the same course, and direct attention to these departments in their order.

## I.—THE MINISTRY.

Mr. Inglis, I find, quotes my tables on the Ministry in full; Mr. King describes them obscurely. Both allow the figures to be quite correct, and that they show an increase of Ministers, in the two Churches before the Union, for the four years ending with 1859, of 55, or 8.87 per cent. per annum; and an increase in the C. P. Church, for the four years ending with 1866, of only 17, or 1.85 per cent. per annum.

While my Reviewers cannot get rid of these facts, they say they can explain how all this happened.

The explanations they attempt are mainly these two, viz.:

1. That fewer Ministers came to us from the old country in the period ending with 1866, than in that ending with 1859.

2. That it is not fair to judge of the Church by a comparison of per-centages.

In reply to the first of these apologies I would say, that I attached little importance to the supply of Ministers at either period in my Review. In the edition published in the *Sarnia Observer*, I did not refer to it at all. The item was only inserted in the pamphlet after a hasty gathering of the particulars from the imperfect reports of Presbyteries. By way of precaution, I gave these reports as my authorities, being myself doubtful of their accuracy. But as I founded nothing on the item, I let it pass as it was. Had I thought it would have been seized on with such avidity by my opponents, I certainly would have worked it up, and set it forth in its true light, as I shall now proceed to do.

Mr. King says that 62 Ministers were received from foreign parts by the churches here, during the four years ending with 1859, and only 15 during the four ending with 1866. Mr. Inglis states the case somewhat differently, and says that 45 Ministers were on the Rolls of the two Synods in 1859, who had been received from abroad during the four preceding years, and that only 15 had been so received during the four years ending with 1866. I am not in a position to say whether these figures be right or wrong. To make them out they require an acquaintance with the *personnel* of the Ministry which I do not possess, and am not able to obtain. I am willing, however, to accept them provisionally, on the authority of my Reviewers.

They go on both to say in effect, that these supplies from abroad account for the large increase of settled Ministers in the period ending with 1859, as compared with that ending with 1866. They certainly tell us where the increase came from. Had there been few or no Ministers to settle, it is obvious that few or none would have been settled. The very fact that more were settled during the former period than the latter, shows that there was more material in the first, out of which settlements could be made. All this is plain, and needs no special sagacity to discern.

But this does not settle the question. It may still be asked, How did it happen that so many

more Ministers came to us from foreign parts during the first period than the last? It is not enough to say there were more—that the supply was greater at the one period than at the other. This just drives the inquiry a step farther back, and we now want to know why it was so. We may be sure it was not a mere chance; but the result of some design and effort on the part of the Church. Mr. King overlooks this question altogether, and thinks he settles the business by simply naming the fact. Mr. Inglis, with a truer insight into the matter, accounts for the increased supply by saying, that “formerly the U. P. Church of Scotland (he might have also said the Free Church), paid the passage money and outfit of Preachers and Ministers coming to this country, besides guaranteeing to each \$500 for three years,” and that through private liberality a number of Gaelic preachers were sent to the Free Church in Canada. Here, then, is the cause of the large supply of Ministers during the four years ending with 1859. The Churches in Canada sent pressing solicitations to the Churches in Scotland for them; and these Churches sent, at their own cost, the men that were wanted. Would we, let me ask, have got these men, unless we had sought for them? No, certainly! A few might have come at their own charges, and for their own convenience, but very few. Accordingly when this foreign aid ceased to be given, the foreign supply ceased to come. Both Churches at home began to think that the Canadian offshoots had become strong and wealthy enough to supply their own wants, and therefore gradually withdrew their subsidies. Thus left to ourselves, we instituted no scheme, made no effort, to meet this special case, and the result has been that the supply of Ministers from the old country has almost entirely ceased.

How differently we acted in regard to other subsidies that were withdrawn by the parent Churches! When the Free Church of Scotland withdrew its grant of \$1,500 per annum from Knox College, did we in Canada fold our hands and do nothing? No. We went to work and made it up. Again, when the U. P. Church in Scotland withdrew its grant for Missions in Canada, did the Church here go to sleep and let things alone? No. It took immediate steps “for the gradual extinction of foreign aid by increasing the Mission income and resources of the Church in the Province.” But were any corresponding efforts made to keep up the supply of Ministers from abroad? None whatever. We left things alone. The result is a sad deficiency of Ministers. We trusted to ourselves, and we failed.

We ought certainly to be thankful that matters are no worse than they are; but it is not right to ignore the fact or to excuse the cause. To know how it happened won't mend the evil. After all our explanations, we have still to lament our shortcomings, and to acknowledge that on account of our negligence our increase in the Ministry has sunk from 55, or 8.87 per cent. per annum, for the four years ending with 1859, to

17, or 1.85 per cent. per annum.

Mr. Inglis says that the figures are correct, and that they show an increase of Ministers, in the two Churches before the Union, for the four years ending with 1859, of 55, or 8.87 per cent. per annum; and an increase in the C. P. Church, for the four years ending with 1866, of only 17, or 1.85 per cent. per annum.

I now which that the to bring her stage way of 1 gregatic adds 50 member year to

In re cumstar propert should; its mate will alv ply t large. Review der all the sam was to and con other.

It is a that if in one like rat not ash gressio questio If we there i cause. ate res by wh

Besi the Ch ates, earlie Church age in was so out of assum youth comp

Mr. it hea sues He th gethe be te Cana do so

17, or 1.85 per cent. per annum. for that ending with 1866.

Mr. Inglis thinks he has shown my "reasoning to be fallacious, and my computations inaccurate." Now pray, Mr. Inglis, where have you shown this? I fail to see it. You have said it, and that is all. Shown it you have not. You have not touched either the one or the other. They stand out clear as ever; good, substantial results, and fair approximations to actual facts.

I now turn to the subject of per-centages, to which my Reviewers allude. Mr. King thinks that the calculations by per-centages are likely to bring out a larger ratio of increase in the earlier stages of the Church than in the later. By way of illustration, he adduces the case of a congregation with 100 members, which in one year adds 50 more to its Roll, and asks, When its membership is 300, must it add 150 the next year to its members?

In reply, I say, this altogether depends on circumstances. If in the last year it had as much proportionate material to work on, why, then, it should; but if it had worked up all, or nearly all its material, why, then, it should not. Increase will always bear a proportion to labor, and supply of material. Mr. King can easily for himself apply the solution of his riddle to the Church at large. But further, I have not in any part of the Review said that a Church must always, and under all conditions, increase from year to year at the same ratio. I knew better. What I did was to take the average increase for one period, and compare it with the average increase of another. There is nothing unreasonable in this. It is a fair way of comparison. I said in effect, that if the Church has increased at such a ratio in one period, why should it not increase in a like ratio in another and similar period? I am not asking either arithmetic or geometric progression, but a proportionate average. It is a question of like causes producing like results. If we do not find the result, we conclude that there is either an absence or a hindrance of the cause. In this case, the lack of the proportionate result implies the absence of that old activity by which the result was accomplished.

Besides, I do not compare the earlier stages of the Church with the later, as Mr. King insinuates. The period ending with 1859 is not the earlier stage of either the U. P. or the Free Churches in Canada. The one was ten years of age in 1855, and fourteen in 1859, and the other was somewhat its senior. Both had then grown out of the unsettled periods of their infancy, and assumed the normal state of a well-conditioned youth. With such a period and the present, the comparison is therefore very fair.

Mr. Inglis, in attacking my per-centages, does it heartily, and shows them no mercy. He pursues a line of inquiry at once bold and original. He thinks the estimate by per-centages altogether fallacious, and goes on to say that it may be tested by applying it to the population of U. Canada. He then proceeds, as he imagines, to do so.

At the outset I must however say, that Mr. Inglis' mode is not mine; it is his own, and quite original.

He takes the increase of the population of U. C. from 1811 to 1841, thirty years, and finds it to be 16.81 per cent. per annum. Then he takes the two apparent decennial periods, ending, the one with 1851, and the other with 1861. He then compares the per-centage of the last (4.66) with that of the first period (16.81), and makes out the difference in favor of the first to be 12.15 per cent.; while yet, says he, with a sort of flourish of trumpets, the population has actually increased from 465,357, in 1841, to 1,396,091, in 1861. This, when one gets to understand it, looks very plausible.

But let me note in reply, that Mr. Inglis commits the fatal mistake of comparing the per-centages of greatly unequal periods. This is radically wrong in principle. It is absurd. I have not attempted anything so outrageous as this. Percentage comparisons, to be of any use, must be made with *equal* and *similar* periods of time. This is my way, and the true way. Mr. Inglis, besides, compares an early and abnormal period of thirty years, with a late and ordinary one of ten. This is also palpably wrong. If he had only carried out his own plan, he would have seen his own folly, and found a strange series of per-centages of no value whatever. If, for example, he had stretched his first period of thirty years to forty, he would have found the per-centage to be 28; and if he had made it fifty years, by carrying it down to 1861, he would have found the increase 35 per cent. per annum. Now he might just as reasonably have compared this 35 per cent. of the fifty years, with the 16 of the thirty years, as compared the 4.66 per cent. of the ten years with the 16.81 of the thirty years. There is no sense in such a calculation. No wonder Mr. Inglis got confused in his own figures, and that he determined to get rid of the pesty per-centages altogether. But it is not the per-centages that are wrong—it is Mr. Inglis.

He is more nearly right when he compares the assumed last decennial periods, but here again he falls into a grave error. He supposes that he has a decade from 1851 to 1861, when in fact the statistics are for 1852 to 1861, a period of nine, and not of ten years. I wonder at my most exacting Reviewer making such a mistake as this! Had he only turned to the Census Act of 1851, he would have found it recorded, "That the census of the Province shall be taken in the month of Jan'y 1852, and in the same month in 1861." The last census is thus for a period of *nine* years, and not *ten*. This affects the per-centage calculation,—makes it 5.20, and not 4.66. A small matter, perhaps; but just like the small matters about which my critics make a great noise, and for which they do not hesitate to apply to me such sweet terms as "careless" and "reckless." Will Mr. Inglis apply his own rule to himself?

The comparison of the census of 1852,—61 with that of 1842,—52, is however fair enough. In the first period, the increase per annum is 10.46, and



in the second it is 5.20 per cent.; or about one-half less than that of the first. This, let me note, brings out a state of things between 1852 and 1861, in regard to the population of the Province, precisely like that which we find in the Church for the four years ending with 1866, and in like manner attributable to internal and not external causes. Who has not heard politicians of the Reform party for the past ten years complaining of this arrest in the country's growth, and ascribing it to a bad Government,—to the mal-administration of the public lands,—to the want of roads and surveys,—to the baneful influence of speculation in wild lands,—and to large landed corporations. These, and the lack of direct efforts to promote immigration, have been over and over again assigned as the causes of the arrested growth of the country.

But in discussing those matters politicians do not quarrel with the per-centages. No. They rather accept of their diets, and go to work by new and reformed methods of administration to repair the shortcomings of the past. This is the true way. It is my way. Mr. Inglis would on the contrary conceal the facts, explain them away, and, like a true Tory, say "Well enough!"

Let Mr. Inglis also note that my tables of comparison for the first period ending with 1859, are taken from years that lie in the very heart of this less prosperous period of the country. This affords another incidental proof of the fairness of my calculations.

Mr. Inglis goes on to notice the fact that there is a gradual decrease of the per-centages of Ministerial increase, from the earlier times down to the later, and thinks I have overlooked this point. To illustrate this he has given a table of the Ministry from 1845 to 1861. But while he seems to see this feature of the calculations, he seems not to be aware of the principle on which it proceeds, and of its proper application to the case in hand.

This decrease in the per-centages in certain cases requires to be understood, if we would use and interpret them aright.

If, for example, the increase per annum be at the fixed rate of so many per hundred, then it is obvious the per-centages will remain the same from year to year. But if the increase per annum be a fixed amount, irrespective of the amount of the principal sum, why, then, the per-centages will show a regular ratio of decrease from year to year; and any exceptional increase or decrease will be marked by a corresponding exceptional increase or decrease in the rate per cent. Applying this principle to the case of the Church, we find that the increase of its Ministry from year to year has not in general been a fixed number per hundred, but a fixed number irrespective of the whole number on the Roll. We may therefore expect that the per-centages will show a regular rate of decrease from year to year. It is not however of this gradual rate of decrease in the per-centages that complaint is made, (although we think that in the particular condition of the country this need not be the case), but of

the decidedly exceptional decrease which we find when we enter within the years of the Union. Before the Union the per-centage increase rises as high as 9.40, and after it, sinks down to 1.85. There is no such fall in any other period, not even as compared with the first four years of the Church's history.

Besides this, I do not rest my calculations on per-centages alone, nor do I demand, as Mr. Inglis insinuates, either a numerical or geometric ratio of increase. I take as a standard of comparison, an average annual increase, with its per-centage, during the four years ending with 1859. With this I compare a like average increase and per-centage for the four years ending with 1866. This is, I think, both fair and reasonable. Whether the per-centage rate of increase of the first period should have been sustained in the second, may be open to debate and difference of opinion, but that the fixed average annual increase of the first period might, and should have been kept up by the Church after the Union, scarcely admits of question. If the Ministry of the Church increased by an average of 9 per annum in the first period, when we were few and separate, it might surely be expected to increase at the same average rate in the second period, when we were many and united. Such is my argument. And when, instead of an equal increase for the second period ending with 1866, I find only 4 instead of 9, and only 1.85 per cent. instead of 8.87 in the Ministry; and a corresponding decay in both the membership and the finances, I naturally conclude that there is something wrong in the Church, which ought to be put right. It is vain to attempt to invalidate these facts by foolish calculations and abusive epithets. They cannot be got rid of. In their triple alliance they possess all the strength of invincible truth.

I have thus shown that, as regards the Ministry, neither the smoke nor the fire of my Reviewers have affected my tables in the least. They stand firm as a rock, and read a lesson to the Church which it would do well seriously to ponder.

## II.—THE MEMBERSHIP.

Mr. Inglis here again gives my tables in full. They show an average annual increase, for the four years ending with 1859, of 2,077, or 12 per cent. in the two Churches; and for the four ending with 1866, of only 1,553, or 5 per cent. in the C. P. Church; showing a falling off in the increase of the latter, of 524, or 7 per cent. per ann.

Mr. King, finding that he cannot in any direct way get rid of these figures, attempts to vitiate them by tinkering one of the columns on which the calculations depend. He wants to add to the statistics of the U. P. Church for 1855, the members of certain congregations not reported in that year, but reported in 1859. By this means he reduces the increase in the membership of the U. P. Church for that period, from 12 to 8 per cent. per annum. But this is playing fast and loose with the figures, and cannot be allowed. There

are six  
pend—  
and lea  
all or n  
a better  
King, I  
statistic  
King w  
unaffec  
cent. in  
the inc  
Mr. I  
very su  
ons," s  
centage  
centage  
hilated  
say to  
cling to  
thus d  
speak t  
to the  
been v  
thod of  
gress  
therefo  
solemn  
by per  
Wh  
indulg  
"adde  
added  
tional  
365 a  
favor  
words  
are to  
of the  
Churc  
there  
durin  
incre  
pared  
been  
a larg  
pared  
Inglis  
will  
Th  
the M  
But i  
differ  
must  
possib  
one t  
a goo  
we to  
Chur  
say,  
this,  
Mini  
is a  
Trie  
incr  
ster  
ordi

are six columns upon which the calculations depend—two for each Church—and to mend one and leave the rest as they are, won't do. Mend all or mend none, is the rule. Mr. Inglis, with a better insight into matters, replies here to Mr. King, by saying that "we must deal with the statistics as we find them." But even if Mr. King were allowed his way, he would still leave unaffected by the change, the increase of 12 per cent. in the Free Church, with which to compare the increase of 5 in the C. P. Church.

Mr. Inglis, in this part of his reply, deals again very summarily with per-centages. "For reasons," says he, "already very fully stated, the percentage argument is wholly worthless." Percentages are thus by one stroke of the pen annihilated. What will our merchants and statisticians say to this new article of faith? Nevertheless I cling to per-centages, all the more that they are thus despised by my Reviewer. To me they speak truth that is far from being worthless. Up to the date of Mr. Inglis' pamphlet, they have been universally regarded by statisticians as a method of great value by which to gauge the progress or decline of a country or a Church. I therefore, and others, will, notwithstanding this solemn declaration of Mr. Inglis, still hold fast by per-centages.

What strange logic Mr. Inglis now proceeds to indulge in? "For every Minister," says he, "added during the first period, there were 151 added to the membership, but for every additional Minister in the second period there were 365 additional members, a difference of 214 in favor of the Church since the Union." In other words, he regards the fewer Ministers that there are to the membership, as a favorable condition of the Church. According to this theory, the Church would have been more highly favored if there had been no increase in its Ministry at all, during the second period; for then the whole increase of its members might have been compared with a cipher; or better still, if there had been an actual decrease in the Ministry, for then a large *plus* of members could have been compared with a large *minus* of Ministers. O, Mr. Inglis, you must mend your logic! This folly will never do.

The numerical relation of the membership to the Ministry is a nice and interesting question. But if we would treat it properly, it must be in a different way from that of my Reviewers. We must as a first step in our enquiry, ascertain, if possible, the ordinary or normal proportion of the one to the other. Having got this, we have then a good standard of comparison. If, for example, we take the ordinary average of members in our Church to each Minister to be 140, we can then say, that if at any time the average rises above this, there is a decline in the proper number of Ministers, and if it falls below this, that there is a decline in the proper number of members. Tried by this fair rule, it will be seen that the increase of 151 members to each additional Minister in the period ending with 1859, is nearly an ordinary number, and therefore that the increase

of the Ministry to the membership is normally proportionate; but by the same rule the increase in the period ending with 1866, of 365 members to each additional Minister, is abnormal, and indicates a great decline in the proper number of Ministers. This is the true way in which to read the figures, the meaning of which Mr. Inglis so grievously misapprehends.

Mr. Inglis now brings Mr. King to the rescue, and introduces a long paragraph from his address, on the subject of immigration. Here Mr. King quarrels with the dates at which I estimate the immigration from Scotland, and proposes others of his own. Nothing pleases Mr. King. It is a paltry point, and amounts to nothing.

He next tries to make a great question of the way in which the immigration enters the Church. This he conceives to be by a slow and gradually percolating process. He assumes that the large influx of Scotch people into Canada, from say 1800 to 1854, had been slowly dropping or oozing into the Church, as into a fountain, up to the year 1859, and there had found rest. He will not allow the period ending with 1866 to have been to any great extent influenced by this percolating process.

It is a fine theory, no doubt, to suppose that a great ocean of Scotch people were settled all of a sudden in Canada, and gradually percolated into the Church down to the year 1859; but unfortunately for its inventor, it is a mere hypothesis, unsupported by a single fact. Granting that there was a percolating process, why stop it at 1859? Why not suppose that it still continues, and is even now replenishing the Church with its drops. I lately visited some Scotch Presbyterians who came to the country in 1803, and are only now beginning to drop into connection with the Church.

The fact is, that the great immigration from the Highlands of Scotland, to which my Reviewers attach so much apologetic importance, terminated almost entirely before my calculations begin. Nor did that immigration come at any time in a great rush, but at an almost uniform annual rate, for the thirty years ending with 1854; the largest number in any year being 7000 in 1851. There was thus no such extraordinary influx of people at any period, as to give an abnormal character to the growth either of the population of the Province or of the membership of the Church. The statistics of the Free Church show an almost uniform rate of increase from their first publication in 1847, on to 1861. The only exceptions to this were in 1851 and 1860, when the increase of members in each was about 3000. But as if to show how little the immigration had to do with this, it can be shown that the immigration was at its maximum of 7000 in the one year, and its minimum of 900 in the other.

This line of argument, to which my Reviewers attach so much importance, might do very well if it could be shown that our diminished increase during the past four years, arose from a lack of people out of whom to make members.



But this is not the case. The time has not yet come when we can say that the harvest has ceased to be plentiful. On the contrary, the fields are even now white unto the harvest, and urgently inviting the Church to go in and reap.

My Reviewers further adduce the statistics of the Methodist Church in Canada, by way of showing that we have companions in tribulation, and that they have made as little progress for the last four years as we have. It may be to us a gratifying circumstance that others are as bad as we are. But in bringing forward the Methodists, my critics fail to note a difference between them and us. They have for the most part to *make* their people; we only gather them. They have to sow and grow, as well as to reap; we have only to reap. They have to seek and find the wandering sheep; we only to fold the waiting flock. Hence it is that their increase, as a rule, is less at any time than ours. Where ours was 12 per cent., theirs was only 5; and when ours was 5, theirs was only 2.24. But how do my Reviewers know that this diminished increase of the Methodists is not due to causes within themselves? Some of their own Ministers think so. The same kind of rigid centralization which is being imposed on us, is said by some to be injuriously affecting them. But whatever may be the cause, it is a very narrow way of testing our progress as a Church, in relation to the general religious progress of the country, by selecting one denomination only as an example. To arrive at a right conclusion on this point, we must take in all the leading Protestant Churches, and compare our own increase with theirs. This neither of my critics have attempted; and even if they had, this would not have altered the special conditions which we find in our Church, or the complexion of either our virtues or our vices.

I demur further to Mr. King's proposal to estimate the increase of the C. P. Church, for the past ten years. Why! The Church is only five years old, and to estimate its increase for ten is absurd. Better far to look the facts in the face, and do the best we can to mend them.

Another point to which my critics attach great importance is the alleged more unfavorable state of the country in the period ending with 1866, as compared with that ending with 1859. Mr. Inglis gives great emphasis to this, and even accuses me of ignorance of Upper Canada, because I do not agree with him. He says that the years 1856,-57,-58, were years of *unexampled prosperity*; that the first really bad harvest was in 1859; that not till 1860 was the commercial depression felt; that 1862,-63,-64, were the very worst years, and so on.

Were I to accuse Mr. Inglis of ignorance of U. Canada in making these grossly inaccurate statements, I would, I am sure, be thought right by intelligent commercial men. I will, however, be more gentle with my critic, and simply say that his zeal beclouds his memory. My statement is, that the two periods selected for comparison, the one ending with 1859, and the other with 1866, are, as regard the state of the country, as

nearly as possible alike; that both have their ups and downs, their summer and their winter. For evidence on this point I would adduce the statistical Report of the Free Church for 1857. It says, "The history of the past year has been remarkable for the pressure on the Commercial world, and no doubt this pressure has affected many of the friends of our schemes. On the whole it would be unfair to estimate the prospective amount of our congregational benefactions from data afforded by a year of *unusual commercial depression*." Again, for 1858 the Report says, "But your Committee are quite prepared to find that in the peculiar circumstances in which the country is placed, that there should be a diminished income." For the same year the Report of the Buxton Mission says, "The commercial distress that has swept over the land, the derangement of our financial affairs, and the almost total suspension of business of every kind on which the settlers mainly depended for support," &c. What does Mr. Inglis say to these emphatic statements? I would only further adduce the financial article of the *Montreal Witness*, for March 15th of the present year, (an authority second to none in the Province), the following in reference to U. Canada. "It will shortly be ten years since the great rebellion which swept to ruin so many fortunes, and prostrated so many interests." I too remember the period well, and my impression is, (confirmed by the testimony of many witnesses) that a time like it, for the complete collapse of the great vital interests of the country, has not since been seen. This is what Mr. I. calls unexampled prosperity. It is granted that the years '63,-'64, were likewise hard times in U. Canada. The cities of Hamilton and Toronto were then special sufferers. But the evil was not universal or long continued. While there was a large emigration to the U. States, there was also a large influx of people thence into Canada. The years 1865,-'66 were further as good years as any the country has ever seen. My critics are themselves very particular in noting the prosperity of at least the year 1866, when discussing the finances of the Church, but they seem to forget, in their one-sided zeal, that it is from this very full-favored year that I take one of the items of my calculations. With great inconsistency they yet accuse me of comparing an adverse with a prosperous period. There is no pleasing my Reviewers. They are determined to make me out wrong. It is the old story of the wolf and the lamb.

I have now shown, in the department of the Membership, that notwithstanding the allied assault of the Address and the Pamphlet, my columns yet stand firm as a rock. The assumed external causes of my critics have been shown to be mere theories, without a shadow of fact to substantiate them. If they existed at all, they affected the first period equally with the last. There is thus no escaping the conclusion, that within the Church itself we must look for the evidences of its own decline. After all, this is a more hopeful view of the case than that of my

opponent power, plained fluences prosper

On t  
ous ass  
ing my  
He cast  
bles sho  
Church  
\$4,746,  
of \$2,6  
of \$7,4  
Church  
increas  
ence in  
\$382, o

In at  
with ve  
covered  
congreg  
Toronto  
glis lab  
enough  
scatter  
the bro  
withere

First  
ending  
Church  
1855, v  
even ro  
ter in t  
to sing

In re  
the co  
sentat  
It is t  
not he  
pend.  
that th  
ount p  
St. Ga  
knows  
memb  
Synod  
mised  
then  
the p  
Then  
amoun  
in the  
paid t  
the en  
return  
intro  
for th  
tory

On  
1855  
it con  
of Mo  
it is c

opponents. It shows that the Church has the power, if it only will, to remedy the evils complained of, and to set in motion a new set of influences that will carry it on with a new tide of prosperity.

### III.—THE STIPEND.

On this item in my tables, repeated and furious assaults have been made. Mr. Inglis, in giving my tables, strangely omits my per-centages. He casts them out of the synagogue. These tables show an average annual increase in the Free Church for the four years ending with 1859, of \$4,745, or 10.50 per cent.; in the U. P. Church, of \$2,665, or 13 per cent.; in the two together, of \$7,410, or 11.60 per cent.; while in the C. P. Church, for the four years ending with 1866, the increase is \$7,028, or 7 per cent., being a difference in favor of the period before the Union, of \$382, or of 4.60 per cent. per annum.

In attacking these figures my Reviewers riot with very joy at an error they seem to have discovered. Mr. King even "surprises" his little congregation in the basement of Cook's Church, Toronto, with the astounding fact; and Mr. Inglis labours to find terms in the dictionary strong enough to express his feelings. They think to scatter all my calculations to the winds, with the breath of their indignation, like a parcel of withered leaves before the blasts of autumn.

First they attack my figures for the period ending with 1859, and say that in the Free Church table I have compared stipend *paid* in 1855, with stipend *promised* in 1859. Mr. King even returns to the assault, in his passionate letter in the *Globe* of April 4th, and challenges me to single combat on the point.

In reply I say, that I have *deliberately* chosen the column of stipend for 1855, as a fair representative, on the whole, of the stipend *promised*. It is the only column in the statistics. It is not headed "Stipend paid," but "Ministers' Stipend." Mr. Inglis is clearly wrong in saying that this column contains "invariably" the amount *paid*. In proof, I refer him to the return for St. Gabriel Street Church, Montreal, which he knows of. On this very point there was, I remember well, a discussion in the Free Church Synod in 1856, when it was debated whether *promised* or *paid* was, or should be, returned. It was then ascertained that for the most part it was the *promised*, and not the *paid* that was given. Then only it was thought better to get at the amount actually paid; and hence the heading in the following year was altered to "amount paid to Minister." But even this did not secure the end contemplated. Many still persisted in returning the amount *promised*. This led to the introduction of the two columns, which we find for the first time in 1859. This is the true history of the matter.

On a critical examination of the column for 1855 it will also be found that for the most part it contains Stipend *promised*. In the Presbytery of Montreal, of which I was then the acting Clerk, it is entirely so. In three other Presbyteries it is

the same, with the exception of one or two cases. In the three remaining Presbyteries, the exceptions are more numerous; but on as careful a scrutiny of the column as is now possible, the difference between the *promised* and *paid* is not more than \$1,260, and this amount does not, I aver, affect "the fair approximation of my tables to the actual facts." In my Review I was careful to note that the statistics for the Membership and the Stipend were not quite so reliable as those for the Ministry, and could only be taken as a "fair approximation." This caution neither of my Reviewers have had the candour to notice, but the rather have pressed my figures into a precision I never claimed for them. I took the statistics just as I found them, confident that they would yield, to those who could read them, a fair index of the state of the Church. What, after all, does all the pother of my Reviewers amount to? Why, only to a paltry amount, not worth while arguing about. It does not affect my tables to any appreciable extent. I can afford to give it up to them. The result will then be, that instead of the increase in the Free Church of \$4,745, or 10.20 per cent. for the term ending with 1859, it will be \$4,429, or 9.50 per cent.; and instead of the per-centage for the two Churches being 11.60, it will be 11.25. A pitiable *one-third of one per cent.* is all they gain, and for which Mr. King has lost his temper and his courtesy.

In regard to the stipend account of the U. P. Church for 1855, Mr. King wants foolishly to mend it, in the same way as he proposed to do with the membership. Here also Mr. Inglis' answer is adequate: "We must deal with the statistics as we find them." The rule is to mend all or mend none.

I now turn to the tables of 1862-'66, about which my critics are quite jubilant. Here I allow an error in my figures, into which I was inadvertently led by taking it for granted that the condensed tables of the Report for 1862 were in the same order as the actual returns. I had made the right calculations, but in the confusion incident to a change in the form of my Review, was incautiously led to take the first column of the condensed table, instead of Stipend *promised*. But after all, this is but a venial error, the correction of which makes things worse for my Reviewers, instead of better. Mr. King in his fiery letter won't even look at the correction. Not he! If he had, it would have cooled his heat. He must look at it, however. It is so damaging to his own cause that it can't be overlooked. Note well the correction, Mr. King, and be comforted if you can.

Stipend promised in C. P. C. for '62,	\$106,776
do. do. do. for '66,	129,711

Increase in 4 years,	\$22 935
Average annual increase \$5,734, or	
about 5.40 per cent.	

This corrected table reduces, as is apparent, the annual increase for the period ending with 1866, from \$6,028 per annum, to \$5,734; and the

per-centage from 7, to 5.40; or less by \$1,361, or 5.85 per cent., than that of the period ending with 1859. On looking at this result, doubtless my astute Reviewers will wish they had left Mr. Kemp's figures alone, and accepted them as on the whole "a fair approximation to the actual facts."

Both Reviewers proceed further to give a different set of calculations from those contained in my tables. They take the Stipend *paid* for the two periods, and find an increase for that ending with 1866, of nearly 8 per cent. per annum. When it suits them, they have no objection to per-centages.

A moment's reflection will, however, make it evident that Stipend *promised*, and not Stipend *paid*, is the real annual Stipend. If, for example, a master agrees to pay a servant \$10 per month, and at the end of the first gives him only \$5, of the second \$1, and of the third \$13, do either of these sums represent monthly wages? Certainly neither. To find what that is, we must either deduct and distribute arrears, or fall back on the original promise. It is the same thing with annual Stipend. To find what that is, we must either deduct and distribute arrears, or fall back on the original promise. To calculate an average Stipend from the amount *paid* in any one year, is quite fallacious. Such calculations may be of value in their own place, but for this purpose they are quite deceptive.

That the year 1866 was a prosperous one for the Church in the matter of Stipend, I have allowed and stated in my Review. That prosperity appears in the payment of about \$4,400 of arrears; an amount large as compared with about \$1,200 for 1862. But neither Mr. King nor Mr. Inglis note the fact, that this was the result of a special effort on the part of the Synod and Presbyteries. In 1864 a Synodical Committee on arrears was appointed; in 1865 they reported, but regretted their failure to accomplish much.—They were re-appointed, and reported again in 1866, but with what result the Minutes omit to say. It is however known, that they did something, and that Presbyteries took action in the case, the result of which was a reduction of the annual arrears of Stipend to about \$9,000, and the payment of about \$4,400. All showing what effort can do, and that without effort the several interests of the Church will either stand still or decline.

My Reviewers fail to read aright the columns of Stipend paid. They place them in opposition to my calculations of Stipend promised. There is however no antagonism between them. The one shows the promise, the other how far, in any one year, that promise has been fulfilled. Any year will be more active or prosperous in proportion as it reaches or exceeds this standard; and will be less so in proportion as it falls below it. On this principle 1866 was a prosperous and active year in the matter of Stipend. In 1862, the arrears were \$12,000; in 1863, they were \$16,000; in 1864, \$14,900; in 1865, \$9,500; and in 1866, \$9,900. These figures indicate a return to finan-

cial prosperity; but they tell us nothing about either the increase or the decline of the Church. They gauge the temporal prosperity of its members, and the greater activity of its rulers in one direction; but they are no index of the increase of either the one or the other. A Church may decline in numbers and in spiritual life, while yet it increases in wealth. It is only by a fair comparison of the state of its Ministry, its membership, and its Stipend promised, that we can obtain anything like an approximate estimate of its actual condition.

Mr. King further accuses me of attempting an estimate of the average Stipend of each Minister "without any attempt at precision"; and then makes an experiment at precision himself, in which, if he had only looked at his method, he would have seen his calculations to be as far from precision as he alleges mine to be. I only aimed at an approximation; he attempts a precision impossible. He has to deduct this item and that, before he gets his data, and then he takes the Stipend *paid* for 1866, with its item of arrears paid, and the result he calls "average stipend." This method is both fallacious and foolish. He miscalls it, by calling it precise. He is, too, very dogmatic in his way. Without revealing his process, he says that "the average Stipend in the Free Church in 1855, according to Mr. Kemp, is \$541; in reality, \$344"; and so on he goes through three long sentences, comparing Mr. Kemp and "reality." But how he gets at his "reality" nobody knows. In his fiery letter in the *Globe* he very modestly says that he is little acquainted with the subtle distinctions of the Nominalists and the Realists of a former age." I should however think, from the frequent use he makes of the term "reality" in the Address, that this disclaimer was quite unnecessary, and that he must be well acquainted with the subtleties of the Realists at least, if not also of the Nominalists, for to me his "realities" appear to be purely "nominal"—mere dicta and guesses.

Mr. Inglis is still more absurd than Mr. King in this matter of average of Stipend. He here introduces another remarkable argument,—queer and original,—to show that the Church was far more prosperous in the term ending with 1866, than in that ending with 1859. He finds that the proportionate increase of Stipend for the first period, gives to each of the fifty-five additional Ministers an average of \$368, while for the second period the like increase gives to each of the seventeen additional Ministers the magnificent sum of \$1880. Why! on this principle if there had been an increase of only one Minister, he would have had the whole increase of \$32,200 of Stipend to himself, and would not that have been magnificent prosperity! What but nonsense can any one call such a calculation as this? O! Mr. Inglis! where were your wits when you penned such an argument as that! A little reflection would have shown that the true way to read these figures is to compare the increase, not of the Ministry, but of the membership, with the in-

crease of Stipend. It would then have been seen that for the first period it was an average of \$3.57 for each additional member, and for the second, \$3.69; showing that the increase in contribution was greater than the increase of members in the latter period, and *vice versa* in the former; or that the average of both periods was very nearly that of the whole membership of the Church. This is the true and fair reading of those items, but they tell us nothing whatever of the proportionate growth or decay of the Church at large.

As to the average Stipend, my calculations are a more reliable and a fairer estimate than are those of either Mr. Inglis or Mr. King.

According to Mr. King's "reality" the average Stipend paid for 1855-'9, was \$453 to each Minister.

According to Mr. Inglis' method, the Stipend paid for the same term was \$415.

According to Mr. Kemp's way of calculation, it was \$463.

On the other hand, for the years 1862-'63, it was, according to Mr. King, \$562,—

According to Mr. Inglis, it was \$539,—

According to Mr. Kemp, it was \$523.

Now which of these is the most correct? neither is more than an approximate estimate. Mr. King by some unknown subtlety reaches his result and calls it "reality." Mr. Inglis, though differing in method, yet like Mr. King takes Stipend paid as the basis of his calculations, whereas I make Stipend promised the basis of mine.

My calculations thus show the actual average Stipend per annum; theirs the average amount of Stipend paid in particular years. Mine is thus not contradictory to theirs, nor theirs to mine. Both are independent calculations; true, each in its own place, and telling each its own tale; mine gives the average promised stipend; theirs the average paid; but mine shows the Church's progress or decline; theirs only the increase or diminution of its wealth and liberality in particular years. I leave Mr. King and Mr. Inglis to adjust the discrepancies of their calculations.

I am further accused by Mr. King of circulating "an injurious report" because I say that there was a falling off of 33 cents per member of average contribution for the 1866 period, as compared with that of 1859. He says, "It is 2 cents in reality," but how he reaches this result no one knows. After revising my tables, I now say that the average contribution per member, for the period ending with 1859, is \$4.01, in the Free Church; \$3.29 in the U. P. Church; \$3.65 in both together. In the C. P. Church, for the term ending with 1866, it is \$3.53, being a decrease as compared with the Free Church, of 48 cents; as compared with the U. P. Church, an increase of 24 cents; and as compared with both, a decrease of 12 cents per member. Such is the state of things as regards the true Stipend—the Stipend promised.

I now dismiss figures. I have replied at length to my Reviewers. They have led me through much dust and mire. It was easy for them to

pry into corners, with my tables to guide them, and to notice the want of a "jot" here, and a "tittle" there. When they try original speculations of their own, how absurd they are, and what a mess they make! How signally they have failed to invalidate my conclusions or to justify their own uncharitable solemnities, must be apparent to every candid reader of this reply.

What matters the minor errors of the statistics which they have noted with such foolish glee? A half per cent. here, and a few decimals there, do not affect the general result. The fact still remains, that our present progress compares unfavorably with our past. We cannot in any way get rid of this uncomfortable conclusion. My Reviewers may console themselves by saying that the causes of this are external, not internal; that the fault is not ours. So Adam said in Paradise. True, he ate the fruit, but then Eve gave it to him. The cause was outward, not inward. It is easy to conjure up outward causes, and to make them appear plausible. But when we find, as in our own case, adequate inward causes, the outward must be abandoned as vain.

I have attempted to lay my finger on these causes, and for so doing, have been accused of unfriendliness to the Union, and of strong prejudices. These accusations are intolerant and untrue. I do not forfeit my claim to be a lover of Union by being a lover of truth. I am a true friend of the Union when I point out germs of evil likely to hinder its anticipated fruits. Has it come to this, that one dares not open his lips to publish what he sees to be for the welfare of the Church, without meeting with storms of angry,—passionate abuse; and being described in terms of reproach? I trust there is a better spirit throughout the Church at large, than has been shown by Mr. King, and that his temper will meet with the condemnation it deserves.

If I have shown some of the weak points in the present condition of the Church, it is because I have faith in its vitality—that a little shaking will not paralyse but rouse its energy. It is the fault of inexperience to lack faith in the Church, or to tremble, like Mr. King, lest she should be hurt by the friendly pruning knife.

I do think, and I fearlessly say, that the Union itself has been accompanied with certain influences that have impaired the Church's activity. My Reviewers may, if they please, sneer at my ascription of a "fine enthusiasm" to the Churches before the Union; and may try to beam that feeling by calling it a sectarian partizanship. Nevertheless there was a fine enthusiasm in the Church then, which it ill becomes the followers of the Erskines to repudiate or disallow. It was a pure enthusiasm, that carried those who fought the "ten years' conflict" through the fiery ordeal to which they were exposed, and enabled them to establish within the strong bulwarks of divine truth, a free and a living Church. Such feelings belong to the best affections of the human heart, which, if my Reviewers never felt, I must call them degenerate scions from the parent stock. That this fine enthusi-

ism has to some extent abated since the Union, I believe. Others may think differently if they choose, but such is the conviction observation forces on me. Some of us certainly regret the past, and cannot but abate somewhat our former affections, when we witness the limitation of our liberties by the institution of central and administrative Committees,—our most vital interests governed by a few men in secret counsel, whom we can neither honor for their wisdom, nor love for their courtesy. I would it were otherwise, but I almost despair of a change till our affairs go from bad to worse, and the Church wakens up to the necessity of acting through its own organized Courts and Ministers, rather than through parasitic Committees,—the invention, for the most part, of human craft and folly.

Here I must correct an error on the part of Mr. Inglis. He puts within quotation marks these words as if they were mine, "Strip of all generous enthusiasm." Now I made no such statement. By such language he falsifies my views. I have besides to complain of the use he makes of the statement, that as yet "we have no special principles to represent." Wholly perverting my meaning, he goes on to say, "If the Church has no principles," &c. He might have supposed that I was not quite so foolish as to say that the Church had "no principles." No attempt has been made to deny or controvert its principles. He might as well have accused me of denying the existence of the Church itself, as of denying its principles. What I manifestly allude to are those "special principles" which belonged, as specific characters, to the Churches of the past. These I say we have very much lost, and we have not yet found a new set.

In regard to the partizanship of which Mr. King speaks as existing before the Union in the Churches, I can only say, that whatever it was, it has not to my observation abated since the Union. Yea, I go further, and say that I have seen more of it since, than before the Union; and that it does not cease to mar the harmony that should exist between many of the congregations of the United Church. We are yet far from having purged ourselves of the *idola tribus*.

As regards the Home Mission scheme, I said of it, and I say again, that it is a cumbrous piece of machinery; that it interferes with the proper rights and liberties of Presbyteries; that it is part of a central system of things that is yearly acquiring larger dimensions, that threatens to suck the life out of the Church, and to impair the free activity of Presbyteries. Such is my solemn conviction, and hence my uncompromising opposition. I do not, however, deny to it the power of doing some work; but yet all it can do could, I believe, be better done by a system less fraught with evil. The advantages, if any, which a central has over a decentral system are those only which an absolute has over a constitutional government; which a Nicholas of Russia, or a Napoleon of France, has over a Queen Victoria or a President Lincoln. But what of that? Who that loves liberty or pro-

gress, or the true greatness of a people, would exchange the system of the one for that of the other? To tell us therefore of the good the Central Committee has done, or may do, is not to reconcile us to it. We still dislike it as an intruder into the sacred precincts of the Church, and a bar to its real progress. It is generally felt to do its work in a rigid way, and there is a red-tapeism about it extremely offensive.

Mr. Inglis is pleased to say that I am alike ignorant of the past history and the present operations of the Home Mission. That may be pleasant for him to say, but it is all a dream. The misfortune is, I know the Home Mission, both past and present, too well. The history of the past, Mr. Inglis will allow, I have "digested." In the process of doing so I have discovered that a central system of Home Missions was never contemplated by the Free Church. Once on a time, in its infancy, it did no doubt attempt to impose on its congregations one of the most curious central financial schemes that ever was devised,—a plan to be administered solely by laymen, and by whom all contributions to Stipend were to be received and administered; but it perished in its very inception. And the Church seemed to have been so alarmed at this daring attempt at its subjugation, that a reaction immediately followed, and a thoroughly decentralized scheme of Home Missions was instituted. The Synodical Committee was instructed only to issue recommendations to Presbyteries. It handled little or no money, and only distributed to Presbyteries the Missionaries they asked for. At the end of the year it made up a report of such scraps of intelligence as its convener could squeeze out of Presbytery Clerks. This order of things was not inconsistent, as Mr. Inglis supposes, with the appointment of a Superintendent of Missions. It was never intended he should do more than follow the instructions of Presbyteries. As early as 1850 the Rev. Mr. Johnstone of Govan was appointed to this office, but never entered on its duties. In 1853, the venerable Professor Gale, to whom the College and the Church owes so much, was created Superintendent of Missions, and Agent of the Widows' Fund, but Mr. Gale's lamented decease put an end to further action. What he might have done had he lived, we cannot say; but this we may venture to aver, that he had too sacred a regard for the constitution of the Church, to have violated any of its provisions, or to have interfered with the proper episcopate of Presbyteries. It is therefore an entire mistake in Mr. Inglis to say, that a central system of Home Missions was ever attempted by the Free Church of Canada. Attempts were no doubt made in this direction from time to time by individual Ministers, but in every case these were defeated by the all but unanimous voice of the Church. So inveterate, indeed, was this feeling, that even an overture in 1857, for a supplemental fund, for weak charges, was rejected, not because of the contemplated Union, for it was then far off, but because of the fixed antipathy of the Church to a central

scheme, go then flour trating its those days debts to w paid off by entirely to incurred could easi teries the prevent t considera by the p Presbyter used to h sources u meet the seems no tlemen, a ous atten

Mr. In or decent Mission the Chur cumbrou I have n tlemen t complex of men o would b would p cessary the sole bounty, to retain adminis —and th of men personal The livi have du tions w quainta Commit sary. I Annual out the Our Mi would t number be pers Mission system proper of the abuse o Ther to the l habit o mittees old and of the sions, I measur thing, relegate



scheme, governed by central men. The Church then flourished by distributing, not by concentrating its power. There was little or no debt in those days, and much Presbyterian work. The debts to which Mr. Inglis alludes as having been paid off by the Central Committee, were not due entirely to the old system; most of them were incurred since 1861, and those which were not could easily have been paid off by the Presbyteries themselves. But the new system will not prevent the accumulation of debts. Already considerable sums are due to the Missionaries, by the places they have supplied; and if the Presbyteries are to be held responsible, as they used to be, for those amounts, they have no resources under the central scheme, from which to meet them. This is an aspect of the case that seems never to have occurred to the central gentlemen, and one that will ere long demand serious attention.

Mr. Inglis attempts to show that the district or decentralized system of conducting our Home Mission work, which many of the best men in the Church urged on the Synod, would be more cumbersome and mechanical than the central plan. I have no doubt it would, had the central gentlemen the framing of it. They would make it complex enough. But if it fell into the hands of men of larger and more generous minds, care would be taken that the District Committees would possess no more power than would be necessary for cohesion,—that they would not be the sole receivers or distributors of the Church's bounty,—and that Presbyteries would be allowed to retain a part of their own contributions, to be administered according to their own judgment,—and that the Committee would be composed of men fitly representing the Presbyteries, and personally acquainted with their fields of labor. The living judgment of Presbyteries would thus have due weight, and the claims of congregations would be determined by an intelligent acquaintance with their peculiar wants. Other Committees than those would be quite unnecessary. Each District Synod would send up its Annual Report to the General Assembly, without the intervention of any other mechanism. Our Ministerial independence and self-reliance would thus not be interfered with, and a larger number of the active men of the Church would be personally engaged in prosecuting the Home Mission work, than is possible under the present system. The Committees would thus take their proper place as the servants, and not the masters of the Presbyteries; and all temptation to the abuse of power would thus be removed.

There is, I apprehend, great danger of injury to the life and liberty of the Church, by the evil habit of these days, of appointing central Committees with large administrative powers. The old and simple way of doing our work by means of the divinely ordered Committees called Sessions, Presbyteries, and Synods, seems in a great measure to have been abandoned. Almost every thing, but the matter of speech-making, is now relegated to Bureaus called Committees. In our

own little Church there are no less than twenty-seven of these; at least ten of which are entrusted with large ecclesiastical powers, in the use of which they are all but supreme. The Church rarely knows anything of their actings till they are accomplished facts. If we must have Committees,—if the constitution of the Church requires supplementing in this way,—we would do well to reduce their number to a minimum, to define their work as strictly as possible, and to bring their proceedings under the direct review of the Courts. In olden times Moderators and Clerks of Presbyteries and Synods used to be their recognized executives, and were held strictly responsible for the discharge of their executive duties. But now all this is changed. For everything there must be a Committee. A new order of things is created, by which the work of the Church is concentrated in some favorite metropolis, and in the hands of an angust few. The result of this is a limitation, if not also a paralysis, of the powers of Presbyteries, endless correspondence, elaborate statistics, irritations and misunderstandings. The first years of my ministry were spent under a Central Mission system. I had thus an opportunity of seeing its working, and was then impressed with the fact, that its action was, in its own nature, grievous and humiliating to pastors and preachers, and injurious to the liberty of Presbyteries. It nevertheless had much to say for itself. It did some good. It collected money. It helped the poor and fostered the feeble. But its good was more than counterbalanced by the lethargy it imposed on Presbyteries, and the irritation it created throughout the Church at large.

As a Church we are in danger of falling under like influences. Our affairs are rapidly becoming centralized in Toronto. A city much to be admired no doubt. Beautiful for situation, it promises to be the Crown and glory of Ontario. Its literature, science, law, and commerce, are worthy of all honor; and, if it were allowable to do so, no better place could be in which to locate the Government of the Church. Already eighteen of our twenty-seven Committees are centered in Toronto. The College and the Missions are almost wholly in its hands. The Board for the examination of students is established there—another of those machines by which Presbyterians are robbed of their constitutional rights, and deprived of a healthy stimulus for the cultivation of the theological literature. All, in fact, of the vital interests of the Church, are centered in this favored city. It is like the bulky body of a spider, and the Presbyteries its attenuated members. This thing is not good, and unless another policy be adopted by the Synod, will work injury to the cause of Christ in this land.

I state it as my sincere conviction, that this central system of things is in its very nature, as well as in the way it is worked, prejudicial to the life, comfort, and liberty of the Canada Presbyterian Church.

Why, let me now ask, is there no defence of the College from the pens of my ardent Review-

ers? Have we no College, or is it so bad as to be indefensible? Why! O my critics, are you silent here! You hit the figures hard, and your own special interests you have defended with zeal; but not an apologetic word have you spoken for the College. I must presume that you agree with me here; your silence implies consent. Yet are you not of those who have timidly tolerated the evil you dare not defend? You were dumb, where a fearless and faithful word would have brought deliverance to the Church. You ignobly receded from the vantage ground on which once you stood. Yea, you spoke honeyed words to the Principal, when plain truth was demanded. The fear of a man sealed your lips. You left to me, at the Synod of 1865, the painful duty of speaking what you were thinking, and now when I speak again the words of truth and soberness, you are mad at me, and yet cannot impugn the testimony I lift up. Constrained by a deep sense of duty, I have thought about the thing that twenty times over I have heard said by many others; and yet, O fearful critics of mine, on this point you are mum; or you whisper, hush! hush! and then raise a great outcry about other inferior things. You tell me I should have waited for the Synod, and gone there with my remarks. You forget I have been there already; and that for nearly ten years I have striven in and out of Synod, to place the College high in the estimation of the Church; and that for ten years all our efforts have failed, and we seem, as a Church, even yet to be resolved to go on, fretfully doing nothing, and expecting Providence to help us. Patience has certainly in this had its perfect work, and may now with a good conscience speak out the truth, impugn it whoso list. Outside of the Synod and the Ministry, there is scarcely a member of the Church that does not see and lament our feebleness, and speak of our want of fidelity in regard to the Principal of Knox' College, in terms anything but courteous. This is the humiliating position in which we stand, and to which with a singular disregard to the welfare of the Church, we seem willing to submit. There are, too, men in the Synod who, from no higher motive than to put down the brother who dares to be honest, will, if allowed, perpetuate the evil under which the Church has groaned for years. Of course I do not class in this category all those who desire to maintain things as they are. There are many who sincerely think that what is, is best. The convictions of such men I will honor; but who can respect the fearful and the faithless?

The state of the College manifestly demands attention. On looking at the statistics, we find that the Free Church alone, in 1856, 1859, and 1860, raised about as much for the ordinary revenue of the College as the C. P. Church, with its largely augmented membership, does now. We raise even now about \$3000 per annum less than is necessary to sustain the College with its present imperfect staff of Professors. These facts are proofs as strong as can be offered, that the Church is dissatisfied with the condition and

management of the College. Only think, when we were 18,000 strong we raised as much for the College, as we do now when we are 40,000. In the one case our contribution per member was 29 cents, and in the other only 13. It is felt, too, by nearly all our congregations, to be more difficult every year to obtain even that small amount. There is indeed a settled disinclination in our people to do more for the College than can be helped. While all acknowledge that it should be liberally sustained and amply endowed, yet most who are able to give, say, "We will do nothing for it in its present condition." It is in vain to plead its importance. We are met with the firm retort, "Well, if it be of importance, why permit it to sink so low in public estimation? Do your duty, and we will give you money."

I cannot help here noticing a plea which some use for keeping things as they are, namely: the interests of Orthodoxy. They fear lest a change in the teachers in the College should be the letting in of a flood of error into the Church; and a lowering of our testimony for the truth of God. It is a contemptible plea, and unworthy of a reply. It exists only in weak and narrow minds. It is an insult to the Church to *think* it, much more to speak it. The truth does not, thank God, depend for its permanency or its power, on the best of teachers; nay, it has more to fear from being allied to a name, than from being left to its own simplicity. The day has gone by when the Church can be led by leaders; or when its fidelity to truth can be affected by any of its professors.

There is an embarrassment in speaking of the College, in one's being constrained to use, for the most part, a general term. One feels a delicacy in being more special. Yet such general terms may seem to reflect on those who are entitled to esteem and honor. I would like to except from the language of complaint the venerable Dr. Burns, who in his own place has served the College with signal devotion, and adorned it by his rare erudition. There are few men whose acquaintance with the literature of theology is so varied and extensive as is his. An hour's talk about books with Dr. Burns, is a great pleasure and profit to any student. He may be said to have created the excellent Library of Knox College, and otherwise to occupy an honorable position in both College and Church. For Professor Cavan I entertain a like esteem to that in which he is universally held by his brethren and the Church. In therefore speaking of the College, I speak only of the major features of its teaching.

Before dismissing the question, I would only further advert to what is said by Mr. Inglis as to the willingness of the Synod to institute a second College at Montreal. This is an entire mistake. When first the matter was spoken of, it was scouted by many; and it was only with extreme difficulty that a majority could be got to pass, even the modified permission given by the Synod. It was like drawing teeth to get what was

then got  
ardent.  
nod, and  
were and  
secured  
first it was  
that its  
nominati  
proval  
nod's pa  
was no s  
than tha  
Even no  
progress  
There is  
tion, tha  
not meet  
tion at t  
be contr  
and con  
gard to t  
they wil  
more fru  
and yiel  
brethren  
amidst r  
of the P  
determin  
ern eyes  
influenti  
I have  
when I c  
presente  
facts and  
have vin  
ate criti

then got. The opposition to it was strong and ardent. More cordiality on the part of the Synod, and a more generous treatment of those who were and are willing to sustain it, would have secured its establishment some time ago. At first it was considered necessary by its projectors that its Board of Management should have the nomination of its Professors, subject to the approval of the Synod. They felt that in the Synod's past management of Knox College there was no security for any better result in Montreal than that which they witnessed in Toronto.— Even now this conviction greatly hinders the progress of the Endowment scheme in the East. There is an apprehension, not without foundation, that the special interests of the East would not meet with a liberal and generous consideration at the hands of the central men, but would be controlled without regard to local feelings and convictions. If the Synod has a just regard to the progress of the Church in the East, they will in future act towards its people in a more fraternal way than they have hitherto done, and yield to the decided convictions of the brethren there, who, with an untiring zeal, are amidst many obstacles, upholding the standard of the Presbyterian Church. If they do not, but determine as heretofore to look East with Western eyes they will irritate and discourage a large, influential, and important section of the Church.

I have now done what I contemplated doing, when I commenced this work of Review. I have presented to the consideration of the Church facts and opinions which I deem important. I have vindicated, against intolerant and passionate criticism, the accuracy of my calculations

and the justice of my remarks. I have protested, in the name of many, against the blind policy of centralization which is marring the beauty and paralyzing the life of the Church. I have spoken words of earnest remonstrance against a scheme of Missionary administration which I sincerely believe to be fraught with injury to the Church. I have sought to awaken the Ministry out of their sinful disregard to the interests of students, and to the evils which are acknowledged to exist in our School of Divinity. I have not written these things from personal motives, as some would say, or from any want of affection for the Church of my fathers. Some things I have written with much pain, and feel that they are only defensible on the plea of duty. I do not wantonly expose the shortcomings of my Church. I am not its enemy because I tell it the truth. Did I think it so feeble that to shake it would hurt it, I would be the last to touch it. But I think otherwise, that it possesses an energy and a life, even if to some extent latent, that will carry it on to attainments higher than any it has yet reached.

I now commend these things to the candid consideration of my brethren in the Ministry and Eldership. Few of them, I am sure, will either think or speak of me after the manner of my intemperate critic, and not a few of them will give me credit for sincerity, and a competent acquaintance with the things about which I write.

In an Appendix I republish my tables, with such revisions as seem necessary, confident that, however disagreeable they look, they are a fair approximation to the actual facts.

# APPENDIX OF TABLES.

## I. THE MINISTRY.

1. THE FREE CHURCH.	2. THE U. P. CHURCH.	3. THE C. P. CHURCH.
Ministers on the Roll in 1855,..... 104	Ministers on the Roll in 1855,..... 60	Ministers on the Roll in 1862,..... 231
" " " 1860,..... 143	" " " 1860,..... 68	" " " 1866,..... 248
Increase in four years,..... 39	Increase in four years,..... 16	Increase in four years,..... 17
Average annual increase,..... 9.75	Average annual increase,..... 4	Average annual increase,..... 4.25
or 9.40 per cent.	or 5 per cent.	or 1.85 per cent.
	The average annual increase for the two Churches will thus be 13.75, or about 8.87 per cent.	

## II. THE MEMBERSHIP.

1. THE FREE CHURCH.	2. THE U. P. CHURCH.	3. THE C. P. CHURCH.
Members reported in 1855,..... 11,191	Members reported in 1855,..... 6,288	Members reported in 1862,..... 60,256
" " " 1860,..... 16,485	" " " 1860,..... 9,203	" " " 1866,..... 36,409
Increase in four years,..... 5,294	Increase in four years,..... 3,005	Increase in four years,..... 6,213
Average annual increase,..... 1,323	Average annual increase,..... 754	Average annual increase,..... 1,553
or 12 per cent.	or 12 per cent.	or 5 per cent.
	The average annual increase for the two Churches will thus be 2.077, or 12 per cent.	

## III. THE FINANCES.

### 1. STIPEND PROMISED.

1. THE FREE CHURCH.	2. THE U. P. CHURCH.	3. THE C. P. CHURCH.
To the first amount \$1,260 are added as a probable difference between stipend promised and paid.		
Stipend promised in 1855,..... \$47,138	Stipend in 1855,..... \$20,553	Stipend promised in 1862,..... \$106,779
" " " in 1860,..... 64,857	" " " 1860,..... 31,215	" " " 1866,..... 129,711
Increase in four years,..... 17,719	Increase in four years,..... 10,662	Increase in four years,..... \$22,935
Average annual increase,..... \$4,429	Average annual increase,..... \$2,665	Average annual increase,..... \$5,738
or 9.50 per cent.	or 13 per cent.	or about 5.40 per cent.
	The average annual increase for the two Churches will thus be \$7,084, or 11.25 per cent.	

### 2. STIPEND PAID.

In adding this table I remark: 1. That it shows how per-centages may be sustained. 2. That I deduct from the Free Church item for 1855 the sum of \$1,260, being a very moderate estimate for stipend promised over stipend paid, contained in the returns. 3. That the stipend paid in 1866 is the result of a special effort to the amount of at least \$4,400.

1. THE FREE CHURCH.	2. THE U. P. CHURCH.	3. THE C. P. CHURCH.
Stipend paid in 1855,..... \$44,618	Stipend paid in 1855,..... \$20,553	Stipend paid in 1862,..... \$101,599
" " " 1860,..... 55,568	" " " 1860,..... 31,215	" " " 1866,..... 133,740
Increase in four years,..... 10,950	Increase in four years,..... 10,662	Increase in four years,..... 32,141
Average annual increase,..... \$2,737	Average annual increase,..... \$2,665	Average annual increase,..... \$8,036
or 6.20 per cent.	or 13 per cent.	or 5 per cent.
	The average annual increase for the two Churches will thus be \$5,402, or 9.60 per cent.	

..... 231  
 ..... 248  
 ..... 17  
 ..... 4.25

..... 60,256  
 ..... 38,489  
 ..... 6,213  
 ..... 1,553

..... \$106,779  
 ..... 129,711  
 ..... \$22,935  
 ..... \$5,738

the Free  
 contained

..... \$101,599  
 ..... 133,740  
 ..... 32,141  
 ..... \$3,035